DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 199 SO 013 466

AUTHOR Meeks, Philip
TITLE Interdisciplinary Analysis and Global Policy Studies.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 23p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association Convention (Philadelphia, PA, March, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Global Approach; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Policy; Research Methodology; *Research Needs; Social Problems; Social Science Research; *World Problems

ABSTRACT

This paper examines ways in which interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary analysis of global policy studies can increase understanding of complex global problems. Until recently, social science has been the discipline most often turned to for techniques and methodology to analyze social problems and behaviors. However, because social science research has of late become so specialized and so concerned with breaking down social problems into ever smaller components, it has become largely irrelevant for pragmatic solving of important social problems. Among the reasons why global policy studies are likely to give better insights than social science research into global problems are that global studies usually focus on broad and complex social problems (as opposed to the narrower problems-focus of social science research); are generally designed to integrate an understanding of social problems with concrete suggestions on how to ameliorate the problems; and are often motivated by a sense of urgency as compared to the social scientists' frequently stated objective of mental puzzle solving. An interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary analysis of global policy studies can give a better understanding of complex problems than can analysis based on a single discipline because it avoids disciplinary parochialism and jargon. At its best, interdisciplinary analysis can take a complex problem and reveal its many facets without becoming obsessed with any one of them and without overemphasizing the culture-specificity of values and problems. In sum, interdisciplinary analysis of global policy studies is a good way to combine expertise from many different disciplines in the search for integrating global values and practical problem solutions (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philip Meeks
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED210199

SO 013 466

INTERDISCIPLINARY ANALYSIS AND GLOBAL POLICY STUDIES.

Philip Meeks

Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the
International Studies Association Convention
(Philadelphia, PA., March, 1981).

JUL 27 19

Interdisciplinary Analysis and Global Policy Studies

Philip Meeks

University of Georgia

Introduction

As the issues and problems facing mankind have become increasingly complex, the tendency has been to break down every problem into its most minute aspects. In many ways this tendency follows the logic of the factory and the industrialization process begun over two hundred years ago. Some benefits derive from such an approach. Since even basic aspects of problems may be difficult to work on, specialization enables one person to handle more specific aspects of complex problems. Familiarity with certain common problems in one's field of specialization allows greater efficiency in overcoming these problems. Since no one can be expected to spend the time trying to learn all of the techniques involved in processing problems, specialization allows more work to be accomplished by fewer people. When problems can be dealt with using a routine similar to that of a computer programmed with thousands of simple steps, capacity can be enormously increased with fewer costs and more accuracy. The factory is by no means the only environment where this logic is dominant. Virtually every bureaucracy is similarly organized and governed.

Social scientists have long recognized that social problems cannot be treated as if they physical objects on some analytical assembly line. Yet the organization of the study of social issues has progressively become more and more specialized. Part of this specialization is economically motivated. In the 1960'sand early 1970's the number of faculty positions

rapidly increased to accommodate the postwar boom in university enrollment and the demand for advanced degrees. The traditional rationalization for granting a doctorate in some field of study was a person's contribution to "original" research or understanding in that field. It became obvious to many that one way to claim originality was to study some very specialized aspect of a problem that no one else had done before. This is not to say that these more specialized studies were less important or accurate than many of the more general studies that preceded them. Quite to the contrary, many of the assumptions and simplistic generalizations of older general studies broke down when their component parts were carefully scrutinized. However, the quest for originality often led to the atomization of fields of study and growing irrelevance of social research for pragmatic solving of important social problems.

Specialization has also been fostered by the predominance of behavioralism and quantitative methodologies in the social sciences in the past thirty years. The quest to be "truly" scientific has led many social analysts to seek to imitate the physical sciences. Like the physicists who break molecules down into atoms and then into smaller and smaller subatomic particles in order to understand their interaction, social scientists have tried to break down various social behaviors into smaller parts in order to improve the scientific "accuracy" of their analysis.

It is relatively easy to break down a problem into smaller and smaller components; to put the parts back together in some meaningful fashion, it is agreed, is difficult. In order to do that one must have an ideal model to serve as the image of reality. In the absence of an agreed upon image, the social scientist has tried to perfect an understanding of his/her own speciality and to simply add it on to everyone else's. The end result of

this acculumation of miniscule parts is usually hopelessly contradictory, redundant and of little practical use to those who must deal with the hard pragmatic realities of the human condition. While social scientists debate and search for more factors to improve the statistical measures of causality, tens of thousands of human lives may be lost.

Global policy studies courses focus on the complex problems on this planet. Ideally they try to integrate a systematic understanding of the problems of nature and humanity with concrete suggestions on how to ameliorate these problems. Global policy analysis and advocacy is motivated by the sense of urgency that, as analysts and as humans, one cannot continue to just engage in mental puzzle solving while ignoring the important agenda of problems afflicting life on this planet. The vast problems of hunger, war, hatred, and injustice cannot be solved by passing them down the specialized assembly line of social analysis in the blind hope that after thousands of minute adjustments the situation will improve. We have spent too much time devising ways of evading responsibility for dealing with a very small part of the solution. We must begin to use time learning how to put things back together rather than break them down in new and different ways.

This paper examines the ways in which interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary analysis of global policy studies can aid the process of reintegrating our currently over-specialized understandings of the complex problems facing the peoples of this planet. Three specific issues are argued:

(1) Interdisciplinary analysis has an important intrinsic value in the contemporary understanding of global problems.

(2) Interdisciplinary analysis can help in the search for a consensus on appropriate global values needed to formulate solutions to complex global problems.

(3) The paper shows some of the ways in which interdisciplinary analysis is indispensable in aiding policy analysis and implementation.

Intrinsic value of interdisciplinary analysis.

> Science wears three hats. It can be considered as (1) a body of accumulated knowledge, (2) a method of arriving at truth, and (3) a collective enterprise -- a structured system of social transactions. These three aspects are critically and thoroughly interdependent. But the dependence of the third on the first and second has been more apparent than has the reverse relation. The tendency has been to write off the collective enterprise aspect, to discount it, if not to deny it outright, in blind insistence upon the 'objectivity' of science.[1]

The systematic analysis and understanding of reality, whether physical or social, has always been a collective enterprise. The interdependence of mathematics and physics is fundamentally obvious to any natural scientist. In the words of Frankel, "Ideological bias, compulsive inattention to facts that later seem obvious, the failure to draw implications that are there, and the repeated drawing of implications that are not there -- all these are part of the physical scientist's analysis as well as of the historian's or sociologist's."[2]

In light of this it is not surprising that the systematic understanding of reality has become so fragmented. The amount of intellectual prejudice and contempt among fields of knowledge is staggering. Universities, which by definition should be integrated institutions of learning of the highest level, have become bastions of defensive cliques. Colleges and departments build walls of bureaucratic exclusion to jealously guard their resources from forays by those of different disciplines. Faculty are discouraged from engaging in collective teaching situations by cumbersome regulations

on required teaching loads. Even though students are granted degrees in liberal arts or in natural sciences, increasing attention, if not predominant importance, is given to one's departmental specialization. General studies programs have virtually disappeared from within colleges. Programs of study that bridge the social and physical sciences are practically nonexistent, so students who want that bridge have to get separate degrees in each.

Many of the reasons for this over-specialized structuring of knowledge and analysis were given in the introduction to this paper. Rationalizations of originality of research, behavioral reductionism in the social sciences and departmental fiefdom-building have all contributed to the atomization of the analysis of reality. The problems of human survival are complex, undeniably but our increasing specialization and division of labor has not given us much more understanding of how to improve life on this planet.

Another important influence away from general studies (particularly in liberal arts) and toward greater specialization has been the careerism of the past decade. Students have been far more motivated by short-term economic considerations and job opportunities than by interest in a well-rounded general education. Thus students have shied away from philosophy, history, arts and language toward skill subjects like computer programming, accounting and general business courses.

Many of our universities now have the worst of both extremes of specialization. On one hand, the faculty includes an excess of those trained in the micro-analysis of particular fields whose practical relevance is questionable. On the other hand, there are far too many students who view their university education purely in terms of practical job skills with little or no thought given to the values inherent in their lifestyle

choices, or to the role of their profession in relation to the pressing needs of the global environment.

One major trend away from field specialization and toward the development of interdisciplinary analysis during the past thirty years has been the growth in area studies programs. The aftermath of World War II and the increased international responsibilities of the United States brought about the recognition of the need to understand better other regions of the world and their problems. The unprecedented demand for interpreters, policy analysts and administrators brought together academics of all disciplines and the emergence of interdisciplinary area studies. The urgencies of wartime needs forced many of the disciplinary boundaries to crumble. After the war the spectacular growth of university education allowed area studies to grow and flourish while at the same time the rapid expansion of training of professionals reestablished the intellectual authority of the old specializations of knowledge.[3]

As long as rapid growth in education and research resources continued there was an uneasy ambiance between these two different approaches to education. As educational growth plateaued and the demand for area specialists declined, hostilities between the traditional departments and the area studies programs became more heated. At the most abstract level, this confrontation focused on how generalized or particularized scientific knowledge about human behavior can or should be. At another level, the debate revolved around the general applicability of Western social science assumptions and biases (dominant in traditional departments) to research and understanding of social problems in non-Western areas. In most cases, the more self-conscious the social scientists became about being scientific, the more they tended to work with a narrow Western data base.[4]

Similarly, the more the area specialists tried to understand the importance of cultural value differences in explaining social behavior (because of antipathy to Western biases and in lieu of much meaningful behavioral data), the stronger the criticism about their being unscientific and "merely descriptive" in their analyses.

Since the early 1970's, area studies programs have declined at many universities, meaning in some cases that those areas were abandoned where faculty expertise was thinnest. In other cases, programs attracting foreign students have been supported to offset losses by American students. The most important factor, however, which seems to hamper area studies programs (and other interdisciplinary programs) is the almost universal mandate at American universities that graduate study past the master's level be focused in a traditional discipline. This usually puts area studies students at a disadvantage, since in addition to language training they must then become proficient at the quantitative skills demanded by most doctoral programs. While these students may have considerable advantage over traditional students because of their knowledge in a variety of disciplines, this competence is often discounted by traditional departments (particularly those which are heavily quantitatively oriented).

Another major factor that has contributed to the decline of popularity of area and interdisciplinary studies is the diminishing number of job opportunities. Academic jobs in social science positions are very scarce as demographic factors reduce enrollments. Careerism has prompted a massive flight from social sciences into business programs. Fiscal problems and budgetary cuts in government spending have reduced government job opportunities both at home and abroad. In the face of all these problems,

many universities have given up and accepted the steady decline of area studies and interdisciplinary programs, viewing the whole situation as if it were merely an aberration of the 1960's.

One year ago, however, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies issued a scathing report, highly critical of present American capabilities in coping with the international environment. In most foreign countries, language abilities and cross-cultural understanding are at much higher levels than in the United States, despite the fact that Americans average more years of higher education. The report suggests that, rather than allow ourselves to revert to previous American patterns of isolationism, American universities redouble efforts to develop new programs of study to better equip Americans to understand and to operate in an increasingly global environment.

Global policy studies programs are a valuable response to this crucial need in American higher education. In many ways these programs combine in a unique fashion several of the best aspects of area studies, interdisciplinary studies and the search for more practical, problem-solving education. By focusing on global problems such as war, hunger, ecological balance and social justice, students and professionals can transcend preoccupation with short-term parochial contingencies and become knowledgeable about longer-range, global consequences. Because global problems are complex, they require competency of analysis from several points of view, with interchange and understanding in both the physical and the social sciences. Finally, since the specific focus is on policy analysis and problem solving at the global level, practivality, missing from many international and area studies programs in the past, is built in.

Obviously, in order for global policy studies programs to be successful, a new openness of attitudes toward interdisciplinary analysis and teaching is called for. Greater cooperation between traditional disciplines is essential if the old suspicious attitudes and bureaucratic jealousies are to be overcome. Instead of concentrating on further atomization of disciplines to pursue original research, more creative solutions can be found in the exploration of new interdisciplinary combinations. While some interdisciplinary subjects such as political economy have become well established, new subjects like social ecology, economic anthropology and geographical psychology are attracting more and more interest. More important than interesting new combinations of disciplines, however, is the need for more interdisciplinary research and teaching where assumptions, biases and techniques of analysis of different disciplines are carefully interwoven to highlight the best of each in addressing a specific problem. Too often interdisciplinary courses are simply multidisciplinary with each standing side by side, as it were, in isolation from each other.

Interdisciplinary analysis is important for global policy studies and for understanding complex problems in general because it avoids disciplinary parochialism and jargon. At its best, interdisciplinary analysis can take a complex problem and reveal the many facets of its reality without becoming obsessed with any one of them. It creates balance, perspective and relevance. Good interdisciplinary scientific analysis should not only be held up as an ideal model of inquiry and understanding, but should also be more vigorously promoted at all levels of education.

Interdisciplinary analysis and the search for global values.

One of the most difficult tasks of our contemporary era is the formulation of a consensus about appropriate global values by which we can guide our actions in response to contemporary problems of our world. By global values I mean those norms and principles which enhance the quality of human life and natural environment on this planet. It would not seem too difficult at first glance to achieve universal acceptance of such values as peace, economic well-being, justice, self-respect, ecological responsibility, and so on. Why then is it so difficult for the people of the world to agree on the appropriate solutions to the common problems which face us all?

First of all, one must deal with those beliefs which maintain that the human condition presently is not problematic: "There have always been wars, famines and disease. They're part of the planet's natural defenses against overpopulation." "It is only man's ego which makes him feel as if his daily troubles are meaningful. He should accept life as it is and remember his utter insignificance as a miniscule life form on a speck of dust suspended in the universe." Holders of such beliefs and attitudes are obviously unimpressed with arguments and concerns over impending nuclear disasters and massive starvation.

Secondly, one must deal with those who believe that, while there are real problems of human existence, these problems are individual in their nature and not global. Millions of people in the advanced industrial countries of the world have never experienced starvation or war or gross social injustice. They recognize that those problems exist, but they believe that they have little direct effect on their lives. For the citizens of the advanced industrial world, problems of inflation, taxation, and

urban transportation, are much more meaningful problems than those of sheer survival.

Finally, there are those who believe that all values and all problems are relative to one's culture. They charge that much of the agenda of those concerned with global survival is simply Western projections of materialism and individualism. Since much of Eastern philosophy and religion is focused on spirituality and the denial of self, many critics argue that it is impossible to construct truly global values, let alone achieve consensus on how to implement them.

Peace would appear to be desirable to both Eastern and Western cultures, as would social justice. In some cases, however, maintaining peace might mean the acceptance of a status quo injustice in social or political terms. For example, young men in India are paid by nuclear power companies to decontaminate radioactive areas by swabbing them down while walking on stilts. They are paid well by Indian standards, but within a few years they contract radiation sickness, return to their homes to contemplate their reincarnation and to die. Is this an example of social injustice?

Even if we could agree on what values such as peace or justice mean in their practical application across cultures, there remains the problem of value priorities. All other things being equal, is it better to have more freedom or more equality? Is it better to have more economic well-being if it means less ecological harmony? Is peace more important than social or political justice?

In view of the difficulty in resolving these tough questions, it's easy to see why so few people have advocated establishing global humanistic values. Is there any meaningful hope that such an endeavor can succeed?

If there is, what role can interdisciplinary analysis play in overcoming some of the perceptual and logical problems of establishing and implementing global values?

One natural advantage that interdisciplinary analysis has in aiding the construction of global value consensus is its predisposition toward integrating different assumptions about human behavior and physical reality. In political economy, for example, a great deal of attention is given to the ways in which the quest for power and resources are closely intermingled. Instead of concentrating just on the motives and acquisition of power or the efficiency with which one conserves or accumulates wealth, interdisciplinary analysis in this case can examine the way in which power affects wealth and vice versa. In turn, one can explore and even systematically verify what effects increasing (or decreasing) equality or freedom have on personal, national or global wealth or power.

Similarly, a new interdisciplinary field like social ecology focuses on the relationship between lifestyles and their effects on natural environments. By exploring the complex relationship between man and his environment, there is inherently an examination of history and philosophy. Thus, once the effort to be truly interdisciplinary is begun, one can begin to get a more systematic, as well as more value oriented, understanding of the human condition. By extending the level of generalization to the global situation, one can begin the process of recognizing of common values.

It would appear, however, that the awareness of values appropriate to all human existence is not enough. What is needed is a means by which value judgements can be made about the appropriate courses of action for the future. There is profound disagreement about whether any such means

exist apart from a strictly individual set of preferences. Thus, on one hand, we have people like C. A. McClelland calling for the necessary creation of a "single, all-encompassing ordering idea."[5] Whereas on the other hand, H. Bull warns that "there is no such thing as a science of end or values that can establish that one course of action is objectively more right or just than another."[6]

This dilemma leads us straight into one of the most difficult problems and long standing controversies of science and philosophy. Can there be an "objective basis" for judging values and reality? One approach to this dilemma is to separate "facts" from values. Science is left to establish what is real while philosophy is left to distinguish values. The rationalization for this separation is that if science is kept value-free it can establish an objective basis for reality whereas values are categorized as inherently subjective. Yet there is great disagreement about whether scientific inquiries about reality can ever be value-free or, indeed, whether they even should be. The point of the whole discussion seems to be that there is no truly "objective" basis for judgment. But does this mean that every judgment is necessarily a totally subjective and individual decision?

While there will never be total agreement on the answer to this important question, it would appear that phenomenological existentialism may provide some insights. Phenomenological philosophy claims to be:

> a philosophy of man in his life-world and to be able to explain the meaning of this life-world in a rigourously scientific manner. Its theme is concerned with the demonstration and explanation of the activities of consciousness of the transcendental subjectivity within which this life-world is constituted. Since transcendental phenomenology accepts nothing as self-evident, but undertakes to bring everything to self evidence, it escapes all naive positivism and may expect to be the true science of the mind in true rationality, in the proper meaning of this term.[7]

The key to understanding this philosophy of science lies in its notion of transcendental subjectivity. For husserl, the founder of phenomenology, subjectivity parallels objectivity so closely that it is interdependent with the latter. The only reality which can have any significance is a constituted reality as perceived and formed by a conscious subject. Through repeated experience, judgments can be made, modified or verified about the nature of perceived realities. Thus, transcendental subjectivity emerges as the repetition of experience gives one the confidence that one's constituted reality conforms with "objective" reality. This "transcendental" logic, therefore, is concerned with determining when a judgment corresponds with a "state of affairs," and hence is true.[8]

The basis of meaning in every science, according to the phenomenological perspective, is the pre-scientific life-world which is experienced by everyone on this planet. Science, in the sense of systematic and rigorous understanding of reality, comes to exist because individuals are constantly experiencing reality and comparing it with their previous experiences. Furthermore, by sharing experiences, individuals (scientists) can establish an inter-dependent subjectivity. When the sharing of transcendental subjective judgments is systematized and proliferated through language and communication, a collective objectivity can be established.

One of the fundamental problems of science is that there has been an over-emphasis on the creation of a static set of "truths" derived through idealization and formalization. As Gunnell has argued, much of this is due to an unnecessary preoccupation with the deductive method of explanation.[9] Instead, what is called for is a constant sharing of subjective experiences without over-formalizing their constituted realities.

By constantly exchanging our appraisals not only of what is but also of what ought to be, we can create a scientific humanism. As natural and social scientists, we can construct paradigms of understanding reality which are based on our shared experiences instead of upon preconceived or predetermined notions wedded to narrow methods or epistemologies. We can share our knowledge of behavior and action as well as its consequences. By fully comprehending the inter-dependent nature of our human existence as well as our understanding of reality, we can establish a transcendental subjectivity and, hence, a common basis for value judgements about appropriate action for the future.

It is obvious that interdisciplinary exchange of our subjective appraisal of causes and effects is crucial for a better understanding of the human condition. Those scientists in university communities have natural advantages of common institutions and forums where they can share their analyses. The average person has far fewer opportunities to share his/her experiences. Yet universities continue to build walls between disciplines and engage in petty fights over teaching credits, library allocations and methodological nit-picking. No wonder common perceptions about universities abound with metaphors about irrelevance, petty jealousies and intellectual contempt. While many scientists, in and out of universities, have realized the inherently interdisciplinary nature of scholarship, few have been willing to come out from the security of their little niches to engage in the collective enterprise of bettering the human condition by bettering its understanding.

Interdisciplinary analysis and policy studies

A long-standing criticism of scientific analysis is its preoccupation with such general theories and abstract assertions that attempt to describe a state of affairs in ways that bear little resemblance to the common man's experience and thus have little to offer him. That is to say, many scientists believe there to be an inescapable tradeoff between scientific exactness and relevant applications of understanding.

For the most part, social scientists have been much more concerned with being able to say something intelligible about human affairs, even if that relevance has come at the cost of greater theoretical generalization. For many social scientists the pragmatic value of their analyses has led to the development of a methodology outside the "ideal" constructs of methods used in the natural sciences in order to achieve this intelligibility. Other social scientists, however, have disavowed the practical relevance of scientific analyses. Instead they have preferred to search for strictly causal explanations and have disdained the probabilistic analyses of others. In some cases, the decision to concentrate on highly generalized propositions was a personal political choice. Especially after the ideological problems of the Cold War and McCarthy periods following World War II, many academics felt it necessary to avoid politically controversial research and analysis in the social sciences.

The problems of very general versus more specific research have been particularly troublesome for area specialists. As Pye accurately recounts:

> In societies in which much was being made of plans for development, academics who were perceived to be generalists in matters of development were often welcomed, while ironically foreign scholars with deep knowledge of the indigenous languages and cultural traits were distrusted. Those who knew the past performances of the society were suspect because they tended to doubt the current rhetoric of development.

> .....As disillusionment about the prospects for rapid development spread among the leaders and the intellectuals of such societies they came increasingly to resent the presence of foreign scholars, particularly those engaged in empirical investigations. Often there was a reversal in attitudes and foreign researchers were denounced for not knowing the local languages and cultural patterns. Scholars interested in earlier times and "safer" subjects became more acceptable, while those concerned with contemporary and emerging trends were suddenly suspect and questions were often raised as to their possible political motivations.[10]

We can see, therefore, that general versus specific research is more than a debate about theoretical merits. Furthermore, what is "safer" politically seems likely to change over time.

It would appear that the recent explosion of interest in policy studies has indicated a swing away from more general theorizing toward more practical problem solving. Part of this interest is a reflection of the more practical "careerist" attitudes of students in colleges and universities in recent times. Another reason for this trend is probably the desire by many scientists, both natural and social, to have greater influence on policy makers in government.

This is not to say that policy studies will be politically any safer than general studies. Quite the contrary, since policy analysts are often required or inclined to rationalize one policy alternative over others, there will be considerable controversy. Policy studies have raised a host of new problems related to the politicization of research and appropriate professional standards which both scholars and policy makers should respect. New charges of scholarly "prostitution" either in favor of particular programs or against particular programs are heard daily. Those cases where defense or criticism of an important policy program may have an important effect on a government's stability or reign are even

more controversial. Thus, we are also witnessing another wave of scholarly inclination to try to avoid all issues of political motivation and individual preference by returning interest back to the classical concerns of the "scientific" basis of their disciplines.

To be a humanist implies on active concern for the state of the human condition in contemporary times. To be a scientist implies an active pursuit of the most systematic understanding of contemporary and historical realities. To be both a humanist and a scientist is to try to use one's systematic understanding of reality to improve the human condition. These two roles need not be in contradiction if one is careful to keep both goals in balance. One should not become so abstract in one's research that there is no conceivable contribution to the betterment of life on this planet. Similarly, one cannot consistently ignore and deny systematically established patterns of reality for purely idealistic reasons.

Policy analysis provides a good medium for combining the interests of humanists and scientists. Since one usually focuses upon some specific problem, there is an empirical focus of research. If the policy is concerned with any one of a number of important human problems, then one's knowledge will hopefully improve living conditions in some way.

The level of one's policy analysis is often a conscious choice about where one believes practical action is the most appropriate. Or it may also involve examining the effects that policies at one level have on conditions at other levels. Global policy studies includes both of these concerns. Ideally, it allows one to focus on a particular problem at the local, national or global level. At the same time it is concerned with the effects that such policies may have on the global environment and the effects which the global environment may have on these policies.

Interdisciplinary analyses are particularly important in policy analyses. The complexity of practical problem solving requires sharing the particular knowledge of many disciplines. Problems of war, hunger, energy, environmental balance and social justice require interdisciplinary answers. Since simplistic policy solutions may have very complex consequences, an effort must be made to attempt to understand the effects of these consequences in many different areas of human existence. This does not mean that there will be easier choices about which benefits outweigh which costs. However, more complete and accurate information about the true nature of these costs and benefits is indispensible to the process of value judgments about appropriate policies. Interdisciplinary approaches to policy studies also give additional safeguards against the possibility that single issue or particular concerns (such as efficiency, equality, stability, or uniformity) will totally dominate the process of policy formation and evaluation.

Policy studies is a good arena in which to bring analysts from different backgrounds and disciplines together. Often it takes common concern over a serious practical problem like pollution or hunger to motivate people to work together to find acceptable solutions. Sharing concern and particular aspects of knowledge builds trust and collegiality and builds the basis for future collaboration on other problems. Even when conflicts arise over preferred courses of action, there will often be compromises that emerge which may anticipate more general social conflicts. Scholars from different disciplines and policy makers can learn to adapt to each others' perspectives in ways perhaps not possible in other settings.

Conclusion

Few scholars and policy makers would deny the importance of interdisciplinary research and training in coping with complex contemporary problems. Yet many of these professionals are still unwilling to engage in more interdisciplinary work and teaching. It takes a certain amount of courage to let go of familiar paradigms, modes of analyses and discipline specific jargon. It sometimes involves a lot of work and bureaucratic manuvering to team teach courses and coordinate different activities. Nevertheless, it seems absolutely essential that interdisciplinary programs, courses and research be increased in the years ahead.

Global policy studies programs are natural breeding grounds for interdisciplinary analyses. These programs try to wrestle with some of the most complex and urgent problems. The search for integrating global values and practical problem solutions requires expertise from many different disciplines. History, philosophy, humanities, natural and social sciences are all needed to bring the proper perspectives to an understanding of how to better living conditions on this planet. We really can not afford the luxery of sitting in our own disciplinary ivory towers waiting for the problems to solve themselves. None of us by ourselves may be able to bring enough of our subjective understanding to sufficiently address the world's problems. Working together, however, we can and must attempt to share our understanding in the hope that it will improve the global human condition.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Holtan Odegard, The Politics of Truth (University, Ala: University of Alabama Press, 1971), p. 81.

[2]John Dewey, The Case for Modern Man (New York: Harper & Row, 1955), pp. 132-33.

[3]Lucian Pye, "The Confrontation between Discipline and Area Studies" in "Political Science and Area Studies (Bloomington, Inc.: Indiana University Press, 1975), p. 5.

[4]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[5]C.A. McClelland, "Field theory and system theory in international relations," in A. Lepawsky, E. Buehrig and H. Lasswell (eds.), The Search for World Order, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971), p. 382.

[6]H. Bull, "New directions in the theory of international relations," International Studies, Vol. 15 (1975), p. 285.

[7]Alfred Schutz, "Phenomenology and the Social Sciences," in J. Kockelmas (ed.) Phenomenology (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1967), p. 452.

[8]Quentin Lauer, Phenomenology: Its Genesis and Prospect (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958), p. 101.

[9]John Gunnell, "Deduction, Explanation and Social Scientific Inquiry," APSR, Vol. LXIII, No. 4 (December, 1969), pp. 1233-46.

[10]Pye, op.cit., p. 15.